

REMARKS

Claims 20-38 are pending in this application and remain for consideration. Claims 1-19 are cancelled by this amendment. The cancellation of claims 1-19 is without prejudice to the filing of a properly copending divisional, continuation, or continuation-in-part application by Applicants directed to the subject matter of some or all of these claims.

Claims 20-38 were allowed.

Claims 1-19, now cancelled, had been rejected under the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112 for lack of enablement.

Claims 1-19, now cancelled, had been rejected under the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112 for indefiniteness.

As only allowed claims remain for consideration, allowance of this application is respectfully requested.

The three-month shortened statutory period for response expires on December 26, 2006. Accordingly, this response is being filed in a timely manner.

This response is being filed in accordance with recently revised 37 C.F.R. § 1.121, as set forth in 68 F.R. 38611 (June 30, 2003). If the amendment is considered to be not in compliance with recently revised 37 C.F.R. § 1.121, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at his earliest possible convenience.

I. AMENDMENTS TO THE APPLICATION

Entry of the amendments to the claims is respectfully requested. As detailed below, the amendments introduce no new matter.

The only amendments made to the claims are the cancellation of claims 1-19. These amendments comply with 37 C.F.R. 1.116 for amendments made after a final action as specifically set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.116(b)(1).

Claims 1-19 were cancelled solely in an effort to advance prosecution in the above-identified patent application. The cancellation of these claims is therefore without prejudice to the filing by Applicants of a properly copending divisional, continuation, or continuation-in-part application directed to the subject matter of some or all of these claims.

II. THE REJECTIONS UNDER THE FIRST PARAGRAPH OF 35 U.S.C. § 112 FOR LACK OF ENABLEMENT

Claims 1-19, now cancelled, had been rejected under the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112 for lack of enablement.

This rejection is now moot as a result of the cancellation of claims 1-19. Although Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejection, these claims have been cancelled in an attempt to advance prosecution.

III. THE REJECTIONS UNDER THE SECOND PARAGRAPH OF 35 U.S.C. § 112 FOR INDEFINITENESS

Claims 1-19, now cancelled, had been rejected under the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112 for indefiniteness.

This rejection is now moot as a result of the cancellation of claims 1-19. Although Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejection, these claims have been cancelled in an attempt to advance prosecution.

IV. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, all claims remaining, namely claims 20-38, are already allowed. Accordingly, prompt issuance of a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested in the above-identified patent application.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael B. Farber, Ph.D., Esq.
Reg. No. 32,612

Date: December 6, 2006

CATALYST LAW GROUP, APC
9710 Scranton Road, Suite 220
San Diego, California 92121
(858) 450-0099
(858) 450-9834 (Fax)